UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,624	02/09/2000	Dean Amburn	AMB 0101 PA	2881

27572	7590	01/13/2006

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
DASS, HARISH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _12 August 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-46_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _1-29, 34 and 36_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _30-33,35 and 37-46_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In view of the amended Appeal Brief In Response to Notice Of Non-Compliant

Appeal Brief on July19, 2005 PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

The Examiner has found new prior art. The Examiner is obliged to apply the

newly found prior art. Thus, the finality of the prior Office action has been withdrawn and

a new rejection follows. The Examiner regrets the delay process of the application.

Accordingly, claims 30-33, 35, 37-46 remain pending in the application.

To Avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the

following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied

by a supplement appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131

or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claims 1-29, 34 and 36 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30-33 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The independent claims 30 and 44 recite limitation "mathematical function" which is indefinite and does not point out to any particular mathematical function.

Claims 35, 37-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular;

Claim 35, lines 16 and 25, claim 37 sections c & g, and claim 44 line 17, the phrase "and/or" renders the claims indefinite because, it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. Make correction to all claims which include such a phrase. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). For purpose of examination only, Examiner assumes that the claim limitation is "or".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 30 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien et al (hereinafter Lupien - US 5,845,266) in view of "CyberTrader – Trader's

Workstation – An Integrated Trading Environment" submitted with IDS (hereinafter

CyberCorp).

Re. Claim 30, Lupien discloses in response to monitoring said decision model,

automatically generating a sell transaction order for the security, and automatically

transmitting the sell transaction order to the market computer [see entire document

particularly, Abstract ; C6 L14-L54; C8 L5-L15, wrap the profile], and in response to

monitoring said decision model, automatically generating a buy transaction order for the

security, and automatically transmitting the buy transaction order to a market computer

[C4 L18-L60] and decision logic for buying/selling [C13 L5-21]. Lupien does not

explicitly disclose receiving from a client of the network accessible brokerage at least

one computer implemented decision model for the security wherein the decision model

comprises a mathematical function for receiving data and providing at least one value,

and inputting data into the decision model, computer implemented monitoring the

decision model for the decision to buy the security wherein monitoring the decision

model comprises comparing the at least one value to the decision point, wherein the at

least one value is compared to a decision point for deciding to buy or sell the security.

However CyberCorp discloses receiving from a client of the network accessible

brokerage at least one computer implemented decision model for the security wherein

the decision model comprises a mathematical function for receiving data and providing

at least one value, and inputting data into the decision model [see selected pages of the

document total of 14 pages, where the "OK" button transmits the order and the system

receives it], computer implemented monitoring the decision model for the decision to

buy the security, comparing the at least one value to the decision point, and wherein the

at least one value is compared to a decision point for deciding to buy or sell the security

[see page 7 of the manual and chapter 14 – "Alerts, Alarms and Automation", page 45-

56, page 48 "scenario 1" the decision point is 79.5; page 49 "scenario 2" the decision

point quarter point from current share; page 53 "Conditional Order Scenarios"; page 54

"Advanced Conditional Order/Stop Loss/Alerts" … "trader learn to write "strings" using

syntax described below …"; page 55 see the conditional script inside the window, where

the decision point is price >= 5 where price is compared to 5] to enable the traders to

write a software script for conditional orders and let the system to execute the orders

automatically. Therefore, it would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time

the applicant's invention was made to modify the disclosure of Lupien and include

computer implemented monitoring the decision model for the decision to buy the

security wherein monitoring the decision model comprises comparing the at least one

value to the decision point. wherein the at least one value is compared to a decision

point for deciding to buy or sell the security, as disclosed by CyberCorp, to let the trader

write computer implemented a trading codes (script) and let the computer execute the

orders automatically based on the script(s), with out human intervention, where the

script is comparing at least one value to the security with decision point as a bench

mark for deciding to buy or sell a security, specially when the price of a security is

changing faster than a human can detect/react.

Re. Claims 44-46, Lupien discloses at least one client computer (terminal) in

communication with the automated trading system via the network wherein the client

computer is operated by a client computer user [Abstract; Figure 1; C1 L24-L64; C6

L14-L54; C8 L5-L15], and a computer implemented transaction approval processor for

determining if a transaction to buy or sell the security is appropriate if the at least one

decision model enters the buy state and/or the sell state [C1 L24-L64; C6 L14-L54; C8

L5-L15], and a computer implemented transaction submission processor for submitting

a transaction to buy or sell the security if approved by the transaction approval

processor, wherein the decision monitor continuously monitors the at least one decision

model and the security is repeatedly bought and sold based on the state of the at least

one decision model and the determination of the transaction approval processor [C1

L24-L64; C6 L14-L54; C8 L5-L15; C6 L34 to C7 L5; C14 L52-L61], and wherein the

logic of the decision model is defined by the user [C1 L24-L64; C6 L14-L54; C8 L5-L15;

C6 L34 to C7 L5; C14 L52-L61], and wherein the logic of the decision model comprises

a moving average [C1 L24-L64; C6 L14-L54; C8 L5-L15; C6 L34 to C7 L5; C14 L52-

L61]. Lupien, does not explicitly discloses and at least one computer implemented

decision model for deciding whether to buy or sell a security wherein the decision model

comprises, wherein the at least one decision model enters a state comprising a buy

state and a sell state, and a data input processor for receiving data from a data source

and inputting the data into the decision model, a computer implemented decision

monitor for monitoring the state of the at least one decision model and mathematical

function for receiving data and providing at least one value wherein the at least one

value is compared to a decision point for deciding to buy or sell the security, However,

CyberCorp discloses these features [see above claim 30] to enable the traders to write

a software script for conditional orders and let the system to execute the orders

automatically. Therefore, it would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time

the applicant's invention was made to modify the disclosure of Lupien and include

computer implemented monitoring the decision model for the decision to buy the

security wherein monitoring the decision model comprises comparing the at least one

value to the decision point. wherein the at least one value is compared to a decision

point for deciding to buy or sell the security, as disclosed by CyberCorp, to let the trader

write computer implemented a trading codes (script) and let the computer execute the

orders automatically based on the script(s), with out human intervention, where the

script is comparing at least one value to the security with decision point as a bench

mark for deciding to buy or sell a security, specially when the price of a security is

changing faster than a human can detect/react.

Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien

and CyberCorp, as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Tertitski et al

(hereinafter Tertitski - US 6,493,681) and Kane (US 6,317,728).

Re. Claims 31-33, Lupien discloses canceling the sell order if the decision model

indicates a trade is undesirable [C11 L1-L22; C19 L22-L40]. Lupien, does not explicitly

disclose wherein the step of generating a transaction order comprises after the step of

generating a sell order, monitoring the sell order until the order is filled, monitoring the

decision model, after the step of transmitting the buy transaction order to the market

computer, confirming the buy transaction, initiating a floating loss, and monitoring the

floating stop loss for a stop loss decision to sell the security, and if a stop loss decision

to sell is reached then automatically transmitting a stop loss sell transaction order for

the security to the market computer, and floating stop loss comprises a dynamic stop

loss. However, after the step of transmitting the buy transaction order to the market

computer and confirming the buy transaction, initiating a floating loss are known.

CyberTrader disclose monitoring the decision model, after the step of

transmitting the buy transaction order to the market computer [see claim 30] to execute

orders automatically. Tertitski discloses monitoring the floating stop loss for a stop loss

decision to sell the security, and if a stop loss decision to sell is reached then

automatically transmitting a stop loss sell transaction order for the security to the market

computer [Abstract; Figures 2-5; C1 L20 to C2 L47; C3 L10 to C4 L10; C4 L50 to C5

L32; claims] to provide day trade recommendation using formula, calculation and best

strategy. Kane discloses wherein the step of generating a transaction order comprises

after the step of generating a sell order, monitoring the sell order until the order is filled

and floating stop loss comprises a dynamic (continuously) stop loss [C4 L66 to C5 L56;

C1 L46 to C3 L62; C18 L20-L55; claim 30] to execute buy and sell orders in

conformance with the buy/sell rules. It would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure

of Lupien and CyberTrader and include step of generating order and, monitoring the

floating stop loss, as disclosed by Tertitski and Kane, to trade securities based of sound

decision model and rules.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien in view

of CyberTrader, Kane (US 6,317,728) and Buist (US 6,408,282).

Re. Claim 35, Lupien discloses providing a computer implemented transaction approval

process for determining if a transaction to buy or sell the security is appropriate [Lupien

– Abs (accommodates stock exchange rules)], and providing a computer implemented

transaction submission process for submitting a transaction to buy or sell the security to

a market computer system and monitoring the transaction until it is completed [C8 L5-

L15; C11 L1-L21], and inputting data into the buy decision model and the sell decision

model wherein the data comprises data for the security [C7 L15-L23], and if the buy

decision is reached then determining through the transaction approval process if a buy

transaction is appropriate and if so then automatically submitting through the transaction

submission process an order to buy the security [C8 L5-L15; C11 L1-L21], and if the sell

decision is reached then determining through the transaction approval process if a sell

transaction is appropriate and if so then automatically submitting through the transaction

submission process an order to sell the security [C8 L5-L15; C11 L1-L21], and

continuing inputting data into the decision models, monitoring the decision models

through the monitoring process, and repeating the steps if the buy decision is reached

or the sell decision is reached until the process is stopped [Lupien- C14 L39-L67], and

the transaction submission process, the buy decision model, and the sell decision

model [C8 L5-L15; C11 L1-L21]. Lupien, explicitly, does not disclose receiving at least

one computer implemented buy decision model for the security, and receiving at least

one computer implemented sell decision model for the security and providing a

computer implemented monitoring process for monitoring the decision models for a buy

decision and/or a sell decision monitoring the decision models through the monitoring

process for the buy decision and/or the sell decision, providing a brokerage having a

broker computer system for transacting orders to buy and sell securities, wherein the

brokerage computer system is in communication with a plurality of client computer

systems, receiving to the brokerage computer system from the client computer system,

providing a computer implemented transaction approval process on the brokerage

computer system for determining after the decision to buy and/or sell the security is

made, and market computer system and wherein the data is input into the decision

model at the brokerage computer system.

However, CyberTrader discloses receiving at least one computer implemented

buy decision model for the security, and receiving at least one computer implemented

sell decision model for the security and providing a computer implemented monitoring

process for monitoring the decision models for a buy decision and/or a sell decision

monitoring the decision models through the monitoring process for the buy decision

and/or the sell decision and has inputs for receiving buy and sell data and input

communicating with the decision logic for executing buy and sell orders in conformance

with the buy/sell rules, monitoring the decision models through the monitoring process

for the buy decision and/or the sell decision [see claim 30] to enable the traders to write

a software script for conditional orders and let the system to execute the orders

automatically.

Kane discloses a securities and/or commodities trading system (Intra-Day trading

system), based on the principles of artificial intelligence, that includes a computer

arrangement communicating with a securities exchange, and providing a computer

implemented transaction approval process on the brokerage computer system (Fig. 1

device connected to # 20) for determining after the decision to buy and/or sell the

security is made (execution logic with an executing logic the affirmed buy short order

and transaction based on recommendations) and E-Trade [Kane – see entire document

particularly, Abstract; C1 L20 to C3 L51; C5 L1-L65; C7 L17-L67; C10 L65 to C11 L60;

claim 8 (decision models = agents)] to monitor the performance of transaction to

minimize the risk.

Buist discloses computer-aided trading of financial instruments, trading of

securities over the Internet, collecting, receiving, disseminating or displaying system

orders, executing system orders and providing a brokerage having a broker computer

system (Fig. 1 # 42; C6 L25-L32) for transacting orders to buy and sell securities,

wherein the data is input into the decision model (trade-decision-making) at the

brokerage computer system [C1 L13 to C3 L63; C6 L25-L32], wherein the brokerage

computer system is in communication with a plurality of client computer systems (Fig. 1

10) operated by a plurality of (unrelated) clients [see entire document particularly,

Figures 1 (# 10, 42, 55, 12, 44), 2-3; 21 (# 2110, 2180), 22 (# 2210, 2265), 25; C1 L56-

67; C2 L1-L3, L38-L45; C3 L1-L5, L15-16; C6 L25 to C9 L5; C31 L48-L66; Claim 1],

receiving to the brokerage computer system (Fig. 1 # 42) from the client computer

system (Fig. 1 # 10) [Fig. 1 # 12 connections], market computer system [Fig. 1 # 55] to

provide Internet based securities trading system. It is known that the broker's job is to

monitor the market whether it is in person or computerized monitoring tools to watch the

market trend. Further, decision of trading securities is a function of the client to set the

rules for buying/selling, either he/she has to enter the parameters into computer or

explain it to his/her broker (authorize broker) and communicate his/her decision to

broker (agent) to finalize the deal.

Therefore, it would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the

applicant's invention was made to modify the disclosure of Lupien and include receiving

at least one computer implemented buy decision model for the security, and receiving at

least one computer implemented sell decision model for the security and providing a

computer implemented monitoring process for monitoring the decision models for a buy

decision and/or a sell decision monitoring the decision models through the monitoring

process for the buy decision and/or the sell decision and has inputs for receiving buy

and sell data and input communicating with the decision logic for executing buy and sell

orders in conformance with the buy/sell rules, monitoring the decision models through

the monitoring process for the buy decision and/or the sell decision, as disclosed by

CyberTrader, to enable the traders to automatically execute order(s) with out human

intervention using software codes, and include monitoring the decision models through

brokerage network, and describe the system architect of on-line (Internet or day-trading)

as discloses by Kane and Buist, to provide system view and system monitoring

capability using user interface (GUI) or automatic evaluating decision logic to monitor a

portfolio of stocks in real time which can shield an investor from loss while maximizing

gain.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien in

view of CyberTrader and Buist (US 6,408,282).

Re. Claim 37, Lupien discloses providing a computer implemented transaction approval

process for determining if a transaction to buy or sell the security is appropriate once

the decision to buy or the decision to sell has been made [see Ref-to-Lupien above],

and e. providing a computer implemented transaction submission process for submitting

the transaction to buy or sell the security to a market computer system and monitoring

the transaction until it is completed [Ref-to-Lupien above], and f. inputting data into the

one or more decision models, wherein the data is input into the one or more decision

models until the process is stopped [see Ref-to-Lupien above], and h. if the decision to

buy or the decision to sell is reached then determining using the transaction approval

process if a buy or sell transaction is appropriate and if so then automatically submitting

using the transaction submission process an order to buy or sell the security [see Ref-

to-Lupien], and h. iteratively repeating above steps f. and g. until the process is stopped

[see Ref-to-Lupien above; C6 L34 to C7 L5; C14 L52-L61]. Lupien, does not explicitly

disclose accepting one or more computer implemented decision models for a security

wherein the one or more decision models comprise logic for deciding to buy the security

and logic for deciding to sell the security, providing a computer implemented monitoring

process for monitoring the one or more decision models for a decision to buy the

security and/or a decision to sell the security; monitoring the one or more decision

models using the monitoring process, for the decision to buy and/or the decision to sell;

providing a network accessible brokerage comprising a broker computer system;

brokerage computer system from the client; providing on brokerage computer system.

However, CyberTrader discloses accepting one or more computer implemented

decision models for a security wherein the one or more decision models comprise logic

for deciding to buy the security and logic for deciding to sell the security, providing a

computer implemented monitoring process for monitoring the one or more decision

models for a decision to buy the security and/or a decision to sell the security;

monitoring the one or more decision models using the monitoring process, for the

decision to buy and/or the decision to sell [see claim 30].

Buist discloses computer-aided trading of financial instruments, trading of

securities over the Internet, collecting, receiving, disseminating or displaying system

orders, executing system orders and a. providing a network accessible brokerage

comprising a broker computer system [figure 1, # 12, 44 & 42]; the brokerage computer

system (Fig. 1 #42) from the client (Fig. 1 # 10); providing on brokerage computer

system (Fig. 1 3 42) [C1 L56-67; C2 L1-L3, L38-L45; C3 L1-L5, L15-16; C6 L25 to C9

L5; C31 L48-L66; Claim 1] to provide Internet based securities trading.

Therefore, it would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the disclosure of Lupien and include accepting one or more computer implemented decision models for a security wherein the one or more decision models comprise logic for deciding to buy the security and logic for deciding to sell the security, providing a computer implemented monitoring process for monitoring the one or more decision models for a decision to buy the security and/or a decision to sell the security; monitoring the one or more decision models using the monitoring process, for the decision to buy and/or the decision to sell, as disclosed by CyberTrader to automate order process, and include providing a network accessible brokerage system, as disclosed by Buist, to provide Internet based securities trading to allow the clients to enter their orders using computer script over the internet and execute the order(s) automatically.

Re. Claims 38-39, Lupien discloses wherein the decision model comprises a moving average calculation of at least a portion of the data [see Ref-to-Lupien above (average price=aggregate average price)], and wherein the decision model comprises a weighted data process [see Ref-to-Lupien; C2 L62-L67; C23 L1-L20].

Claims 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupien, CyberTrader and Buist, as applied to claim 37 above and further in view of Kane (US 6,317,728).

Re. Claims 40-43 Lupien, CyberTrader or Buist does not explicitly disclose after the steps of submitting an order to buy the security and monitoring the transaction until it is completed, automatically initiating a floating stop loss process for selling the security wherein either the floating stop loss process or the decision model can reach a decision to sell the security, and wherein the floating stop loss is a dynamic floating stop loss, and the step of validating the data before the step of inputting the data into the decision model, and further comprises logic to sell short the security and logic to buy to cover the security. However, Kane discloses these steps: after the steps of submitting an order to buy the security and monitoring the transaction until it is completed, automatically initiating a floating stop loss (stop loss order) process for selling the security wherein either the floating stop loss process or the decision model can reach a decision to sell the security, and wherein the floating stop loss is a dynamic (monitoring stocks continuously) floating stop loss [see Ref-to-Kane above; C2 L22-L34], and the step of validating the data before the step of inputting the data into the decision model [see Ref-to-Kane above; C7 L34-L67; C13 L25-L65], and further comprises logic to sell short the security and logic to buy to cover the security [see Ref-to-Kane above; C3 L20-L58] to provide a security trading system to individuals and trading house which monitors and executes trades automatically.

Therefore, it would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the disclosures of Lupien, CyberTrader and Buist and include above steps, as disclosed by Kane, to allow the investors minimize their investment risk by using the automatic monitoring and trade execution system.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harish T Dass
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

1/9/06